

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION AT DAYTON**

DIANTHA SANDERS,	:	
Plaintiff,	:	Case No. 3:14cv00106
vs.	:	District Judge Thomas M. Rose
		Chief Magistrate Judge Sharon L. Ovington
CAROLYN W. COLVIN,	:	
Acting Commissioner of the Social	:	
Security Administration,	:	
Defendant.	:	

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS¹

This case is before the Court upon the parties' Joint Motion For Remand. (Doc. #10). In light of the parties' agreement, the Court finds that an Order entering judgment in Plaintiff's favor and against Defendant, and remanding this matter to the Social Security Administration under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. §405(g) for further administrative proceedings, is warranted.

The parties agree that, on remand, "the Appeals Council will remand the matter to an administrative law judge for a new hearing and a new decision, with instruction to the administrative law judge to obtain evidence from a medical expert to clarify the nature and severity of Plaintiff's impairments; reassess her residual functional capacity, including reevaluating the opinion evidence of record; and, if necessary, obtain

¹ Attached hereto is a NOTICE to the parties regarding objections to this Report and Recommendations.

supplemental evidence from a vocational expert to clarify the effect of the reassessed limitations on the occupational base.” (Doc. #10, *PageID#* 545).

IT IS THEREFORE RECOMMENDED THAT:

1. The parties’ Joint Motion For Remand (Doc. #10) be GRANTED;
2. The Clerk of Court be directed to enter Judgment in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendant reversing Defendant’s final decision and remanding this matter to the Social Security Administration pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. §405(g) for further proceedings consistent with an Order adopting this Report and Recommendations; and
3. The case be terminated on the docket of this Court.

November 10, 2014

s/Sharon L. Ovington
Sharon L. Ovington
Chief United States Magistrate Judge

NOTICE REGARDING OBJECTIONS

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), any party may serve and file specific, written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations within **FOURTEEN** days after being served with this Report and Recommendations. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(d), this period is extended to **SEVENTEEN** days because this Report is being served by one of the methods of service listed in Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(C), (D), (E), or (F). Such objections shall specify the portions of the Report objected to and shall be accompanied by a memorandum of law in support of the objections. If the Report and Recommendation is based in whole or in part upon matters occurring of record at an oral hearing, the objecting party shall promptly arrange for the transcription of the record, or such portions of it as all parties may agree upon or the Magistrate Judge deems sufficient, unless the assigned District Judge otherwise directs. A party may respond to another party's objections within **FOURTEEN** days after being served with a copy thereof.

Failure to make objections in accordance with this procedure may forfeit rights on appeal. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 (6th Cir. 1981).